

Appln. No.: 09/854,334
Reply to Office Action of June 1, 2007

Amendments to the Drawings

Applicants submit herewith a replacement sheet including FIGS. 3A and 3B to replace the originally filed drawing sheet including FIGS. 3A and 3B.

Attached: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have reviewed and analyzed the Office Action dated June 1, 2007, and provide the following remarks and comments in response thereto. Applicants note that the undersigned is new counsel of record pursuant to the Power of Attorney filed August 30, 2007. Claims 6, 17 and 32 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 8-13, 15, 16, 18-23, 25-29, 31, 33 and 34 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-31, 33 and 34 remain pending upon entry of the present amendment.

Objections to the Drawings

Applicants have amended FIG. 3A and the Specification, thus rendering this rejection moot.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action indicates that the specification is objected to because the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicants respectfully disagree. The present title "UNIVERSAL PROGRAMMING SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR EPG WITH LOCALIZED INTERACTIVE CONTENT," is sufficiently descriptive of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 23 and 28 stand objected to because of minor informalities. Claims 23 and 28 have been amended thus rendering this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12-17 and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Martino *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,177, "Martino"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 relates to, *inter alia*, memory storing a first object and a second object, the second object configured to define an interactive component for display in an interactive electronic programming guide (EPG), wherein the interactive component includes localized content; and a processor configured to generate the interactive EPG by combining the

first and second objects, wherein an appearance of the interactive EPG is defined by the first object. Nowhere does Martino teach or suggest such features. At most, Martino discloses the use of different worlds for different functions such as a search world, a profiling world and an overview world. Col. 2, ll. 21-22. Nonetheless, Martino does not teach or suggest a second object defining an interactive component having localized content and generating an EPG by combining the second object with a first object defining an appearance of the EPG. Indeed, there is no mention of any combination of objects in Martino. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claims 12 and 23 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 13-16 and 24-27 are dependent on claims 1, 12 and 23, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claim and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

For example, claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, “first object is selected from a plurality of world objects based on selected content, wherein each of the plurality of world objects defines a different world.” Martino does not teach or suggest such a feature. Again, Martino is limited to three worlds: a profiling world, a search world and an overview world. Nonetheless, there is no teaching or suggestion in Martino that a world is chosen based on selected content. Accordingly, claim 8 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7, 10, 11, 18-22 and 28-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martino in view of Finseth *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6, 754,906, hereinafter “Finseth”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 7, 10, 11, 18-22, 28-31, 33 and 34 depend on claims 1, 12 and 23, respectively, and thus incorporate all of the features of their respective base independent claims. As discussed above, Martino fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1, 12 and 23. Finseth does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Martino. Accordingly, notwithstanding the validity of the asserted combination of Martino and Finseth, the asserted combination would not have resulted in the features of claims 1, 12 and 23, upon which claims 7, 10, 11, 18-22, 28-31,

